DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 035 PS 017 956

AUTHOR Baumrind, Diana
TITLE Sex-Differentiated Socialization Effects in Childhood and Adolescence in Divorced and Intact Families.
SPONS AGENCY Grant (W.T.) Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Apr 89
GRANT WTGF-G-84044973
NOTE 57p.; Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development (Kansas City, MO, April 27-30, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Children; Comparative Analysis; *Divorce; *Family Influence; Family Structure; Longitudinal Studies; *Nuclear Family; Parent Influence; *Sex Differences; *Socialization

ABSTRACT

This longitudinal study was designed to identify familial origins of children's developmental competencies and dysfunctional behavior at the critical life stages of preschool (T1), juvenile (T2), early adolescence (T3), and early adulthood (T4). Child subjects were born between 1964-66; their parents between 1931-39. Children were studied when they were 3, 9, and nearly 15. At T1, all families were intact; by T2, 19% were divorced; and by T3, 37% were divorced. The third wave of data gathering (that is, the adolescent phase) took place between 1978 and 1980, and included 139 adolescents and their parents. Families were predominantly middle-class, educationally advantaged, and Caucasian. Data were drawn from three sources: measures derived from behavior ratings used to summarize case history information; microratings made of parent-child interaction at T2 and T3; and self-reports obtained from each parent at T3. Numerous findings concern sex differences in children, parenting practices by sex-of-child and sex-of-parent, family dynamics at T3, moderating effects of family status on sex-of-child differences and maternal behavior, and sex-differentiated socialization effects. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED307035

SEX-DIFFERENTIATED SOCIALIZATION EFFECTS IN CHILDHOOD AND ADOLESCENCE IN DIVORCED AND INTACT FAMILIES

Diana Baumrind, Ph.D.

April 27, 1989

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The William T. Grant Foundation has provided consistent and generous support of this longitudinal program of research including the present phase of analysis of the early adolescent data (supported by grant #84044973). During the preparation of this paper author was partially supported by a Research Scientist Award (#1-K05-MH00485).

PS 017956

Presented at the Society for Research in Child Development symposium on "Differential Socialization of Boys and Girls--Revisited," Kansas City, Missouri, April 27-30, 1989

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Diana Baumrind
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SEX-DIFFERENTIATED SOCIALIZATION EFFECTS IN CHILDHOOD AND ADOLESCENCE IN DIVORCED AND INTACT FAMILIES

Diana Baumrind, Ph.D.

Examination of gender-related phenomena is secondary to this longitudinal study's main objective which is to identify the familial origins of children's developmental competencies and dysfunctional behaviors at critical life stages--preschool (T1); juvenile (T2); early adolescence (T3); and early adulthood (T4). The identification and interpretation of sex differences in child behavior or parent behavior, or in the sex-differentiated effects of similar parental behavior is complicated by measurement and design problems. Measurement problems include the difficulty of remaining blind to the sex of the subject, and the generally much less reliable information available about fathers than about mothers, because of fathers' lower involvement in childrearing. Design problems include spurious and sample-specific sex-differentiated effects that do not replicate.

Child subjects were born between 1964-66, and their parents between 1931-39. We first studied them when they were three years old, again when they were nine, and then again when they were 14 3/4. At T1, by design, all families were intact; by T2, 19% of the families were divorced; and by T3, 37% were divorced. I will include data on divorce as a moderator of sex-differentiated socialization effects at T3.

Sample

The third wave, that is the adolescent phase, took place between 1978 and 1980, and included 139 adolescents and their parents, from predominantly middle-class, educationally advantaged Caucasian families.

Measures

At each time period one team of observers spent about 20 hours with the child and a different team spent about 30 hours with the parents, prior to completing a comprehensive set of ratings. The adolescent data include assessments of: (a) physical fitness, maturational status, and nutritional status; (b) social and emotional functioning; and (c) cognitive functioning in school. For parents as well as adolescents, we assessed (a) political and social attitudes, (b) moral judgment level and attitudes, (c) alcohol and drug use, (d) health practices, (e) intellectual ability, and (f) personal problem behavior.

For this presentation, I will include three data sources:

1. Measures derived from the behavior ratings used to summarize the case history information,

2. Microratings made of parent-child interaction at T2 and T3, and

3. Self-report data obtained from each parent at T3.

---

1. The comprehensive behavior ratings, completed at each time period by separate teams of observers for the child and for the parents, focus on competence. But problem behaviors and stressors at each time period were also assessed.

2. Microratings of behavior occurring at T2 and T3 provide further information.

a) At age 9, the children were videotaped twice, first during a free-play situation with only the observer present, and then again when playing with the same toys with one self-selected parent. Only 21 fathers out of 145 families chose to accompany their child--usually

their daughters. The playroom toys included a "feminine" area with dollhouse and doll family; and directly adjacent, a "masculine" area with castles, moat, lake and knights. In addition, there were active, risk-taking toys including stilts, trampoline and a pair of styrofoam sabers; and a comfortable couch and coffee table with adult magazines so that the parent could choose to play with the child or read close-by.

b) At age 14 1/2, both parents and the adolescent listened to a taped recording of a fictional dialogue between an adolescent and parent in conflict over the adolescent's use of marijuana. They were then asked to discuss and try to come to agreement among themselves about seven questions including (1) If you think the family has a problem, who is responsible for the problem and why? and (2) What should parents do and not do if they want to influence their adolescent's use of drugs? Each family member was rated from the videotape of the discussion by two raters on a set of scales assessing gender role behavior, communicative competence, distribution of power in the family, family atmosphere, supportiveness, cognitive factors and task focus.

3. The third source of data to be summarized today came from a Family Life Self Report, completed by each parent at T3, and contains sections describing the parents' disciplinary practices, the adolescent's responsibilities and privileges, and the division of labor in the household around childrearing, housekeeping and authority issues.

Results

ANOVAs were used to assess sex-of-child and sex-of-parent main effects, and sex-of-child by sex-of-parent interactions. Sex-differentiated effects were examined either through interactions in an ANOVA when the independent

variables are categorical as with sex or family structure; or with tests of the significance of the difference between correlations when variables are continuous. Multiple regression analyses were used to identify the unique contribution of correlated parent variables whose zero-order relations to male and female adolescent prosocial or problem behaviors differed significantly. For ease of understanding, I will refer to the underlying constructs rather than to the specific variables on which the tests of significance were run. All results to be discussed, including those based on the presence of interactions, are significant at the $\leq .05$ level unless otherwise stated. Gender effects that are present only in divorced families will be so identified.

Sex Differences in Children

I will first summarize the sex differences for children at each of the three time periods.

At T1, preschool girls compared to boys were more friendly and somewhat more cooperative. **[Table 1]** But girls whose parents would shortly divorce manifested more mild problem behavior.

At T2, ages 8 to 9, gender differences were most prominent. **[Table 2]** Girls compared to boys were more friendly, cooperative, achievement oriented, and generally competent, but also more concerned with appearing socially desirable. Boys were more peer-ascendant and internal in their locus of control, especially for undesirable performance. In the playroom, children's choice of toys was sex-stereotyped, but more girls than boys played with cross-sex toys. **[Table 3]** Girls were more likely to sit, groom, play with the dollhouse and art material, smile and look at the observer. Boys were more likely to play with the castles and knights, plumbers' pipe, and pool

and divers, and were generally more active. However, boys and girls were equally likely to use the risk-taking toys--the stilts and the trampoline. With mothers present in the playroom, boys were more inclined to play by themselves, and girls to include mothers in their games ($t = 3.06$, $p < .004$).

At T3, in early adolescence, even with chronological age, biological stage and timing of puberty controlled, there were few sex differences in level of competence or problem behaviors. **[Table 4]** Boys tended to be over-represented at the highest level of drug and alcohol usage and sexual acting out. Girls endorsed more feminine, but not fewer masculine, items on the Bem, but were not more communal, as they had been earlier. Girls continued to be more gregarious and more concerned with appearing socially desirable.

Parenting Practices by Sex-of-Child and Sex-of-Parent

To be presented now, for intact families, are sex-of-child and sex-of-parent main effects of parenting practices, as well as sex-of-child by sex-of-parent interactions. The many sex-of-parent differences, especially at T2, are quite small, although consistent.

At T1, mothers compared to fathers were less firm and confronting and more responsive; and manifested more externalizing problem behavior. Parents were firmer with boys than with girls. **[Table 5]**

At T2, mothers compared to fathers were more directive and structuring and used more guilt induction, but were also more responsive, especially with their sons. **[Table 6]** Fathers compared to mothers were more conventionally sex-typed in their treatment of their sons; and more rule-oriented, irascible, demanding of household help, and firm with children of either sex. Fathers were also more field independent, had a higher moral judgement score, and manifested less externalizing problem behavior. Both parents were more

intellectually stimulating in their treatment of their daughters than their sons, and provided daughters with more structure and positive reinforcement. In the play situation, parents with sons engaged more in active play ($t = 1.97$, $p < .05$), and parents with daughters in more interpersonal contact ($t = 2.10$, $p < .04$). The correlation between fathers' expressive interaction and children's active play, such as trampoline and fencing, was significantly greater for boys than for girls. Expressive interaction included criticism as well as supportive compliments, laughing and talking. **[Table 7]**

At T3, the most striking difference between parents in intact families was level of involvement. **[Table 8]** Both parents agreed that even mothers who work more than 50% spend four times as many hours as their husbands in childrearing activities. Husbands whose wives worked increased their housekeeping activities from 5 to 7 hours a week (still less than one-half the time spent by their working wives) but decreased their childrearing activities from 7 to 5 hours per week. Mothers were more officious and exerted more assertive control than fathers. **[Table 9]** According to their self-reports, **[Table 10]** both parents of adolescents used more frequent negative sanctions with sons than with daughters, such as expressing disappointment, physical punishment and time-out; whereas fathers, more frequently with daughters than with sons, used praise to encourage good behavior.

Family Dynamics at T3

At T3, sex differences in family dynamics are captured well by the Family Interaction Discussion. **[Table 11]** During the Family Interaction Discussion, relations between mothers and daughters were more contentious than for any other pairing, and discussion was more friendly with sons than

with daughters. Fathers, compared to mothers, were more willing to confront and sharpen disagreements, whereas, with sons particularly, mothers were more likely to harmonize and make peace. With girls only, fathers were more playful. Fathers and daughters formed coalitions, excluding mothers. However, daughters treated mothers as more capable than fathers of understanding and appreciating their point of view. With sons, mothers were less constrained and more engaged. Mothers treated fathers with more respect than fathers did mothers. There were no gender differences in the allocation of what we designated as sex-typed tasks, namely food serving and handling the recording equipment.

Moderating Effects of Family Status on Sex-of-Child Differences, and on Maternal Behavior

Family status moderated the sex-differentiated treatment by mothers of their sons and daughters, indirectly affecting sex-of-child differences. Fathers who would later divorce were less responsive and self-confident, and more abrasive and emotionally disturbed than those who would remain intact, but equally so with sons and daughters. However, mothers who would divorce, even prior to divorce, manifested laxer discipline and more problem behavior with their daughters than with their sons.

At T1, by design, all families were intact and children were screened to eliminate serious problem behavior. With both sexes, in intact families who were to divorce by T2, fathers were less responsive than other fathers, and mothers less structured, self-confident and well-adjusted than other mothers. Mothers who would divorce by T2 indulged in role-reversal with their daughters, but not with their sons. That is, mothers who would divorce within 3 years both demanded more maturity and were more exploitive and

maladjusted with their daughters than with their sons. **[Table 12]** Five out of six of their daughters manifested mild externalizing problem behavior. **[Table 1]**

At T2, already-divorced mothers required more household help from their 9 year old sons than their daughters--possibly in lieu of adult male support. **[Table 13]** To-be-divorced mothers were laxer in their control of their daughters. **[Table 14]** Both divorced and to-be-divorced mothers manifested more externalizing problem behavior with daughters than with sons. **[Tables 12 & 13]** Their daughters were not adversely affected at the time. **[Table 2]** But by early adolescence, the sex-differentiated effects of the low demands of mothers divorced between T1 and T2 were evident in the higher externalizing problem behavior and somewhat (<.10) less socially responsible behavior of girls than of boys. **[Table 15]**

At T3, as they had been prior to divorce, divorced mothers of girls were more maladjusted and somewhat (<.10) more exploitive than divorced mothers of boys. **[Table 16]** Unremarried mothers also used less assertive control with their daughters than with their sons, possibly because they were more depressed. The apparently egalitarian--perhaps enmeshed--relationship that unremarried mothers had with their adolescent daughters contributed to the mental health of neither. Thus, in divorced families with unremarried mothers, girls compared to boys were more emancipated and explorative, and manifested much more externalizing problem behavior, including drug and alcohol use and sexual acting out **[Table 4]**. In divorced families with remarried mothers, boys compared to girls were more resilient but used more alcohol and were more sexually active. **[Table 4]** Parenthetically, **[Table 17]** the 11 mother-custody boys, compared to the 6 father-custody boys, were

significantly less creative, but more mature, resilient and cooperative--probably because in this sample, father custody was associated with mothers' death, illness or rejection, rather than with exemplary attributes of the fathers who assumed custody.

Sex-differentiated Socialization Effects

Do boys and girls respond differently to similar parental socialization practices? To address this question, we tested the significance of the sex difference in the magnitude of the parent-child correlations when the correlation for at least one sex differed significantly from zero. **[Table 18]** Although the instances in which the magnitude of the adolescent-parent correlations differ significantly for boys and girls exceed chance, most such differences are theoretically unimportant.

Some sex-differentiated effects are unimportant because they are nullified when the difference in the magnitude of the range of the parent variable for boys and girls is controlled. For example, at T1, paternal confrontational control (i.e. firm demands combined with irascibility) was associated strongly with internalizing problem behavior for boys and not at all for girls. But this was because significantly more fathers of boys than of girls were highly confrontational: 13 fathers of boys and only 3 fathers of girls scored more than 1 S.D. above the mean on confrontational control. With the upper tail trimmed, the sex-differences in the magnitude of the correlations of paternal confrontation with internalizing problem behavior disappears.

Some sex-differentiated effects are highly sample-specific. These are associations between problem behaviors of parents and children that occur disproportionately in divorced or to-be-divorced families. Thus, at T1,

problem behaviors correlated more highly for opposite-sex parent-child dyads, an apparent sex-differentiated finding. But, since at T1 only 8 children, 6 from to-be-divorced families, were rated as having even as many as 2 or more problem behaviors on the Achenbach, the generalizability of this sex-differentiated finding is questionable.

Some sex-differentiated effects that are not sample-specific or spurious may be meaningful, although they are not central to this study's objective. For example, fathers' conservatism at T2 and mothers' conservatism at T3 were more highly related to boys than to girls' conservatism and lack of competence. At T2, fathers' conservatism and religiosity correlated negatively more highly with boys' than with girls' social confidence, general competence and emotional stability. At T3, adolescent-parent conservatism correlated more highly in cross-sex dyads: mothers' restrictive conformity correlated more highly with boys' than with girls' conservatism, and fathers' nonconformity correlated more highly with girls' than boys' liberality.

The sex-differentiated effects that were not sample-specific or spurious and that are of theoretical interest in the context of this study will now be briefly summarized.

At T2, when sex-differentiated effects were most prominent, girls were clearly affected more positively than boys by parents' demandingness; and boys more positively than girls by mothers' responsiveness and personal adjustment. Maternal responsiveness correlated more highly positively with boys' than with girls' creativity, achievement orientation, and general competence. Mothers' problem behaviors correlated more highly for boys than for girls negatively with creativity, and positively with internalizing problem behavior. Firm, confrontational discipline and provision of

structure and regimen had consistently stronger positive associations with girls' than with boys' social assertiveness and self-confidence, and consistently stronger negative associations with girls' than with boys' problem behavior. Similarly, mothers' directiveness correlated negatively with girls' but positively with boys' externalizing problem behaviors. **[Table 18]**

It is of considerable interest to note that the strong sex differences in children's behavior manifested at T2 were distributed unequally by parenting pattern, suggesting that children's sex-stereotyped socioemotional behavior is highly influenced by parents' socialization practices. **[Table 19]** There were no sex differences at all in Authoritative families, whereas, compared to girls, boys in Disengaged families were more peer-ascendant and less socially responsible; boys in Lenient families were less socially responsible; and boys in Authoritarian families were less achievement-oriented and generally competent.

At T3, in early adolescence, the number of significant associations between parents' and children's behaviors were significantly greater for girls than for boys, and for mothers and daughters than for any other parent-child dyad. For example, maternal Supportive Control, which assesses responsive, rational discipline and emotional closeness, was much more negatively related to girls' than to boys' drug use; and maternal Assertive Control, which assesses firm, direct discipline clearly communicated, and close monitoring of children's activities, was much more positively related to girls resilience, self-regulation and socially responsible behavior. **[Table 18]** Adolescent girls were clearly highly responsive to maternal influences; and this was particularly true in divorced families.

We noted serendipitously that certain parent-child correlations were systematically greater for girls than for boys, only in divorced families. At T3, in divorced but not in intact families, maternal Assertive Control consistently correlated more highly pdsitively with girls' than with boys' prosocial behaviors [Self-regulated, Socially Responsible]; and maternal Internalizing and Externalizing Problem Behaviors consistently correlated more highly negatively with girls' than with boys' externalizing problem behaviors, including drug use and sexual acting out. **[Table 18]**

In order to assess the unique effects of family status and of the maternal processes related to divorced status, we entered the family variables which were significantly correlated both with divorced status and with the targeted adolescent dependent variable into a multiple regression. Of course, in divorced families with mother custody, paternal variables could not be evaluated, since these fathers were no longer in the home. The targeted adolescent dependent variables were Socially Responsible behavior **[Table 22]** and Externalizing Problem Behavior. **[Table 21]**

The Socially Responsible cluster, assessing facilitative, considerate, amiable, cooperative, dependable behaviors, was selected as the purest measure of prosocial behavior. With Socially Responsible as the dependent variable, Supportive Control accounted for considerable variance in both boys' and girls' social responsibility. Assertive Control accounted for significant variance in girls' but none in boys' social responsibility, confirming the sex-differentiated influence of Assertive Control on children's social responsibility. Together, Assertive Control and Supportive Control accounted for 40% of the variance in girls' social responsibility, and 17% for boys. Family status contributed no unique variance to children's

social responsibility. Neither did maternal Externalizing problem behavior, despite its high zero-order correlations with children's Socially Responsible behavior. (Maternal Externalizing Problem Behavior assesses exploitive, untrustworthy, egocentric behavior towards the child.)

We then repeated the multiple regression analysis with adolescents' Externalizing Problem Behavior (i.e. delinquent, negative, impulsive, emancipated, alienated behavior) as the dependent variable. For Externalizing Problem Behavior, the significantly greater zero-order association with family status for girls also disappeared in the multiple regression. The negative impact of divorce and of maternal Externalizing Problem Behavior on girls were mediated by low maternal Assertive Control, which together with Family Disorganization accounted for 34% of the variance in girls', and 20% of the variance in boys', externalizing problem behavior.

Thus we see that the apparent sex-differentiated effects of divorce on children's prosocial and externalizing problem behaviors were mediated entirely by the sex-differentiated effect of low maternal Assertive Control, which was associated more strongly with single parent status for mothers of girls than for mothers of boys. Lax control throughout childhood and adolescence had significantly greater negative associations with girls' than with boys' competence; and divorced mothers of girls had been more lax and maladjusted than divorced mothers of adolescent boys even <u>prior</u> to their divorce. Maternal Assertive Control is important for both sexes to develop optimally, but especially so for girls. Assertive maternal control both models and stimulates self-assertive, socially responsible behavior in children, generating an affectionate respect for mothers that is especially effective in enhancing competence and preventing problem behavior among

adolescent girls, even in divorced families.

To conclude: In studying sex-of-child, sex-of-parent and sex-differentiated socialization effects, we have set our sites on a moving target, because expectations pertaining to sex-role behavior are in flux. Sex-difference in socioemotional behavior, far from being immutable, are subject to parental influence. The moderating effects of sex on parent-child relations may be spurious, sample-specific, or account for very little variance. When a focal independent variable such as divorce reliably affects males and females differently for a specific targeted variable, it is important to seek the processual parental practices that mediate the moderating effects on the targeted child behavior of the interaction between sex and that independent variable. Assertive parental control is one such mediating mechanism.

Handout for:

SEX DIFFERENTIATED SOCIALIZATION EFFECTS IN CHILDHOOD AND ADOLESCENCE IN DIVORCED AND INTACT FAMILIES

Diana Baumrind, Ph.D.

Presented at the Society for Research in Child Development symposium on "Differential Socialization of Boys and Girls--Revisited," Kansas City, April 27-30, 1989.

REPRESENTATIVE ITEMS FROM T1, T2 AND T3 CHILD SCALES

T1 Preschool Measures to Accompany Tables 1 and 18:

Dominant: [Reliability = .90] Peer leader; Has a mind of her/his own; Initiates activities for other children; Individualistic; Resists domination of other children.

Purposive: [Reliability = .95] Participates in group activities; Characteristically occupied; Stands out as positive force; Purposive; Commits self to activities.

General Competence: [1st Principal component] Stands out as positive force; Confident; Participates in group activities; Self-starting and self-propelled; Commits self to activities.

Friendly: [Reliability = .91] Appreciates another child's point of view; Sympathetic toward other children in distress; Is not a bully; Respects other children's work; Does not assault another child's ego.

Cooperative: [Reliability = .96] Complies with adult directives; Complies with school rules; Actively facilitates school routine; Self-controlled and thoughtful; Accepts adult authority.

Internalizing Problem Behavior: [Reliability = .81] Depressed, sad; Feels worthless; Feelings hurt when criticized; Easily led by peers; Shy or timid.

Total Problem Behavior: [Reliability = .90] Sum of 110 items from the Achenbach & Edelbrock (1983) that include Internalizing and Externalizing Problem Behaviors.

Externalizing Problem Behavior: [Reliability = .88] Bossy with peers; Doesn't become guilty after misbehaving; Hostile to adults; Physically attacks people; Disobedient with parents; Impulsive.

T2 Primary School Measures to Accompany Tables 2, 17 and 18:

Peer Ascendant: [Reliability = .84] Likes to compete with children in physical activities; Resists domination; Argues with other children; Challenges self physically.

Socially Confident: [Reliability = .95] Participates in group activities; Self-assured in peer interactions; Initiates activities for other children; Bold with other children; Peer leader.

General Competence: [1st Principal component] Appreciates adult's viewpoint; Altruistic; Appreciates another child's viewpoint; Assumes internal control of life outcomes; Gives best to work and play.

Optimum Competence: [5 Most Characteristic from Ideal Q-Sort] Has sense of identity; Socially confident with adults; Interacts smoothly with other children; Comfortable and secure with adults; Willing to pursue tasks alone.

Creative: [Reliability = .96] Ideationally fluid; Generates a variety of ideas; Original ideas; Problem solves creatively; Verbally fluent.

Achievement Oriented: [Reliability = .95] Problem oriented; Gives best to work and play; Challenges self intellectually; Purposive; Internally motivated to get good grades or learn.

Friendly: [Reliability = .95] Altruistic; Does not assault another child's ego; Sympathetic toward other children's distress; Friendly toward peers; Appreciates another child's point of view.

Cooperative: [Reliability = .95] Complies with school rules; Trustworthy; Does not test limits; Actively facilitates school routine; Complies with adult directives.

(Internal) Locus of Control, Crandall IAR (Crandall, Crandall & Katkovsky, 1965):

Responsibility for Doing Poorly: [Reliability = .66] 2 typical items--**3.** When you read a story and can't remember much of it, is it usually **(a)** because the story wasn't well written, or **(b)** because you weren't interested in the story? **15.** When you forget something you heard in class, is it (a) because the teacher didn't explain it very well, or **(b)** because you didn't try very hard to remember?

Total = Responsibility for Doing Poorly + Responsibility for Doing Well [Reliability = .63]

Social Desirability, SD Scale (Crandall, Katkovsky & Crandall, 1965):

Social Desirability: [Reliability = .79] 2 typical items--**12.** Sometimes do you things you've been told not to do? (no) **4.** Do you sometimes tell a little lie? (no)

Internalizing: [Reliability = .77] Emotionally labile (moody); Cries; Feels worthless; Sulks; Fearful.

Emotional Disability: [Reliability = .83] 3 point scale--absent, present, severe.

Externalizing: [Reliability = .74] Bossy with peers; Screams a lot; Disobedient with parents; Argues a lot; Explosive behavior, hot temper.

REPRESENTATIVE ITEMS FROM T1, T2 AND T3 CHILD SCALES (continued)

T3 Adolescent Measures to Accompany Tables 4, 15, 17, 18, 19 and 20:

Emancipated: [Reliability = .89] Has own criteria of appropriateness; Not concerned with adult approval; Resists domination; Will incur adult disapproval.

Socially Conscious: [Reliability = .84] Has existential concerns; Works for social change; Community oriented; Socially idealistic.

Explorative: [Reliability = .88] Seeks interpersonal challenges; Poised; Initiates peer activities; Courageous; Able to gratify impulses.

Gregarious: [Reliability = .91] Has close friends; Gregarious; Actively engaged; Well-liked by peers.

Resilient: [Reliability = .88] Flexibly adaptive; Socially sensitive; Sees self accurately; Socially skilled; Copes well with stress.

Optimistic: [Reliability = .90] Cheerful and enthusiastic; Hopeful; Proud of accomplishments; Euphoric; Lively; Self-accepting.

Cognitively Motivated: [Reliability = .93] Puts forth intellectual effort; Optimistic intellectually; Perseveres intellectually; Orderly intellectually; Intrinsically motivated intellectually.

Achievement Oriented: [Reliability = .95] Interested in school success; Actively strives for excellence; Challenges self intellectually; Values intellectual pursuits; Does well in school.

Social Desirability from the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974): [Reliability = .78] Helpful (+); Moody (-); Theatrical (-), Happy (+); Sincere (+).

Femininity from the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974): [Reliability = .89] Yielding; Affectionate; Loyal; Feminine; Sympathetic.

Self-Regulated: [Reliability = .95] Productive; Self-contained; Can delay gratification; Organized; Reflective.

Socially Responsible: [Reliability = .96] Facilitative; Considerate of others; Amiable; Benevolent; Friendly towards adults.

Family Self-Esteem: [Reliability =.80] I am satisfied with my family relations (+); I have a good relationship with my mother (+); I don't live up to my father's standards (-);I have good relationship with my father (+); My father cares about me (+).

Traditional Religious Beliefs from the Jessor & Jessor Self-Report Belief Inventory (Jessor & Jessor, 1970) [Reliability = .77] Important to believe in God; Important to go to religious services; Find moral answer in religion; rely on religious guidance.

Conservative Social Beliefs from the Jessor & Jessor Self-Report Belief Inventory (Jessor & Jessor, 1970): [Reliability = .81] People should support their government, right or wrong (+); A college education should be available to all regardless of grades (-); Students in high school should have more say in their schools (-); Work of mother is caring for children (+).

Ethical Beliefs about Drugs: [Reliability = .79] Wrong to use marijuana regularly; Wrong to experiment with marijuana; Wrong to drink alcoholic beverages; Wrong to try drugs for experience.

External Locus of Control from the Nowicki-Strickland Locus of Control Scale (Nowicki & Strickland, 1973): [Reliability = .74] 2 typical items--3. Are some kids just born lucky (yes). 6. Do you believe that if somebody studies hard enough he or she can pass any subject? (no).

Internalizing Problem Behavior: [Reliability = .89] Insecure; Self-pitying; Suffers mental anguish; Feels worthless; Depressed, sad.

Total Problem Behavior: [Reliability = .89] Sum of 110 items from the Achenbach & Edelbrock (1983) that include Internalizing and Externalizing Problem Behaviors.

Alienation: [Reliability = .71] I am bored by what I do; The adult world is cold and hypocritical; There is little in the world to count on; I feel like I don't belong; People will take advantage if they can.

Externalizing Problem Behavior: [Reliability = .92] Delinquent; Negative identity; Excessive risk-taking; Impulsive; Unusually independent.

Alcohol Usage: [Reliability = .84] Total Nonuser; Virtual Nonuser; Light Recreational User; Regular Recreational User; Heavy Recreational User; Heavy Regular User.

Drug Usage: [Reliability = .88] Rational Nonuser; Nonuser; Experimenter; Recreational User; Heavy Recreational User; Heavy Regular User.

Sexual Acting Out: [Reliability = .79] Promiscuous; Sexually active (coitus).

REPRESENTATIVE ITEMS FROM T1, T2 AND T3 PARENT SCALES

T1 Parenting Measures to Accompany Tables 5, 12 and 18:

Expresses Anger: [Reliability = .83] Expresses impatience when child is annoying; Expresses impatience when child disobeys; Confronting manner; Not afraid of child's anger; Expresses and defends anger.

Confronts: (Composite of Expresses anger and Firm)

Firm: [Reliability = .93] Persists after child's initial noncompliance; Successfully exerts force or influence; Cannot be coerced by child; Forces confrontation when child disobeys; Requires child to pay attention.

Maintains Structure and Regimen (Joint): [Reliability = .75] Supervises child's bedtime hour closely; Sets schedule for child; Restricts time and content of TV viewing; Supervises child's eating closely.

Demands Maturity: [Reliability = .75] Early toilet training; Discourages babyish speech and mannerisms; Limits bottle and pacifier; Demands mature table behavior.

Responsive: [Reliability = .88] Disciplines supportively; Remains open when child disagrees; Encourages intimate verbal contact; Warm.

Self-Aware & Self-Confident: [Reliability = .91] Has clear ideals for child; Clear about parental role; Can specify aims and methods of discipline; Regards self as potent influence; Confident as parent.

Encourages Individuation and Independence: [Reliability = .89] Encourages individuality in child; Offers child alternatives; Defines child's individuality accurately; Individualistic; Encourages nonconformity in child; Encourages independent action.

Internalizing/Maladjusted: [Reliability = .85] Maladjusted; Stigmatized; Labile; Unhappy; Frequently ill.

Externalizing/Exploitive: [Reliability = .74] Exploits child; Untrustworthy; Egocentric; Sociopathic; Encourages acting-out.

T2 Parenting Measures to Accompany Tables 6, 13, 14 and 18:

Maintains Structure and Regimen: [Reliability = .86] Maintains a structured household; Sets schedule for child; Keeps household orderly and clean; Sets physical regimen for child.

Directive: [Reliability = .83] Discourages independent action; Restricts child's efforts to explore; Controls intellectual content; Overprotective; Restricts choice of friends

Conventional: [Reliability = .92] Uses sex-stereotypes to evaluate child's behavior; Sex-stereotypes self; Discourages sex-atypical traits in child; Thinks contemporary challenge is wrong; Nonresponsive to challenge to parental authority.

Traditional Religious Beliefs from the Jessor and Jessor Self-Report Belief Inventory (Jessor & Jessor, 1970): [Reliability = .84] Important to believe in God; Important to go to religious services; Find moral answer in religion; rely on religious guidance.

Proscriptions from the Jessor and Jessor Ethical Beliefs and Social Beliefs scales (Jessor & Jessor, 1970): [Reliability = .86] Hitting someone because you are angry is wrong (+); It is wrong to drink and drive (+); It is wrong to have sexual relations before marriage (+); As times change, so does what is right and wrong (-).

Rule Oriented: 15 items assessing moral maturity (Hogan & Dickstein, 1972).

Expresses Anger: [Reliability = .80] Not afraid of child's anger; Expresses and defends anger; Expresses impatience when child disobeys

Requires Household Help: [Reliability = .84] Demands child clean own messes; Requires that child take care of own room; Sets regular tasks; Regards child as competent to help with chores.

Positive Reinforcement: [Principal component score] Pays focused attention; uses praise and encouragement; criticizes the child without sarcasm.

Firm: [Reliability = .93] Cannot be coerced by child; Requires child to pay attention; Discourages obstructive behavior; Persists after child's initial noncompliance; Restricts temper tantrums; Exercises power to obtain obedience.

Responsive: [Reliability = .93] Responsive to child's bids for closeness; Disciplines supportively; Warm; Encourages intimate verbal contact; Attentive to child

Intellectually Stimulating: [Reliability = .88] Provides intellectually stimulating environment; Values excellence for the child; Engages in intellectually verbal interaction; Invokes cognitive insight; Has clear ideals for child.

Differentiated 2nd Order Principal Component (Joint): [Includes Intellectually Stimulating + Individuated and Self-Confident]

Individuated and Self-Confident: [Reliability = .90] Can define own individuality; Can define own identity; Differentiated and stimulating; Confident as parent; Secure during visits.

Internalizing/Maladjusted: [Reliability = .80] Maladjusted; Stigmatized; Labile; Unhappy; Frequently ill.

Externalizing/Exploitive: [Reliability = .72] Exploits child; Untrustworthy; Egocentric; Sociopathic; Encourages acting-out.

Field Independence: Scores from the Witkin Rod-and-Frame task (Oltman, 1968).

Moral Reasoning: Scores from the Kohlberg Moral Judgement Interview (Kohlberg, 1971).

Guilt Induction: Observer rating assessing use of guilt induction on 1 to 5 scale.

T3 Parenting Measures to Accompany Tables 9, 16, 18, 19 and 20:

Intrusive/Officious: [Reliability = .84] Intrusive; Does not respect child's privacy; Subverts child's independence; Forces self on child; Overcontrolling.

Directive/Conventional: [Reliability = .93] Encourages obedience; Molds child's lifestyle; Controls child's sexual activity; Values conventional appearance; Opposes teenage sexuality.

Conforming: [Reliability = .94] Traditional lifestyle; Conforming; Respects traditional values; Conventional; Old-fashioned.

Assertive Control: [Reliability = .93] Code of behavior clear, explicit; Requires child to pay attention; Expects obedience; Comfortable with child's anger; Enforces rules.

Supportive Control: [Reliability = .97] Considerate of child's feelings; Disciplines responsively; Takes child seriously; Invokes cognitive insight; Appreciates child.

Considerate: [Reliability = .95] Considerate; Sensible of others' feelings; Dependable and trustworthy; Tactful; Non-manipulative.

Internalizing/Maladjusted: [Reliability = .88] Maladjusted; Stigmatized; Labile; Unhappy; Frequently ill.

Externalizing/Exploitive: [Reliability = .80] Exploits child; Untrustworthy; Egocentric; Sociopathic; Encourages acting-out.

Family Disorganization: [Reliability = .57] Chaotic-Organized; Unstable-Stable.

Table 1

T1 Preschool Child Attributes by Sex of Child and by Family Status

(Intact at T2 vs. Divorced T1-T2)

[All T1 to T2 Subjects]

	COMMUNAL				PROBLEM BEHAVIOR				N	
	Friendly		Cooperative		Total Prob.Beh.		Externalizing			
Family Status	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B
Mean										
Intact at T2	53	49	53	49	54	50	52	51	38	50
Divorced T1-T2	55	47	52	49	66	51	61	52	6	7
F-Ratio										
Status	.01		.00		3.46+		7.61**			
Sex	4.48*		3.23+		7.18**		7.03**			
Interaction	.34		.03		2.10		6.48*			

NOTE: Means are reported only for terms which are significant ($p < .10$) in the ANOVA.
+ = $p < .10$; * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$.

Table 2

T2 Child Attributes by Sex of Child and by Family Status

(Intact at T2 vs. Divorced T1-T2)

[Sample = all T2 subjects]

	AGENTIC		GENERAL COMPETENCE				COGNITIVE COMP.		COMMUNAL				LOCUS OF CONTROL (Internal)				SOCIAL DESIRABILITY	
													Crandall IAR					
	Peer Ascendant		Gen. Comp.		Optimum Comp.		Ach. Orien.		Friendly		Cooperative		Responsibility for Doing Poorly		Total		Crandall	
Family Status	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B
Mean																		
Intact at T2	48	52	52	50	51	49	52	48	52	47	54	47	47	53	48	53	50	48
Divorced T1-T2	46	51	53	46	53	47	52	47	55	49	52	48	46	54	46	52	57	51
F-Ratio																		
Status	1.20		.01		.11		.13		.92		.04		.05		.41		5.90*	
Sex	3.22*		5.53*		4.50*		3.97*		6.67*		7.21**		13.19***		6.07*		3.99*	
Interaction	.04		.85		1.37		.08		.40		.30		.44		.04		.81	

	N	
	G	B
Intact at T2	60	73
Divorced T1-T2	18	13

NOTE: Means are reported only for terms which are significant ($p < .10$) in the ANOVA.
* = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$.

Table 3

Significant Sex Differences in Child's Play Behavior and Toy Choice at Time 2

	Girls ($N = 71$)		Boys ($N = 75$)		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t^a
	Play Behavior				
Items characteristic of girls:					
Sit	5 54	1 38	4 53	2 02	3 48***
Self grooming	3 92	2 00	2 88	1 85	3 25***
Chuckle	1 17	1 42	62	1 20	2 51***
Smile	2 52	2 12	1 55	1 74	3 00***
Play at nurturance	45	88	0	0	4 46***
Look at observer	2 85	1 99	2 18	1 71	2 17**
Items characteristic of boys:					
Walk	3 00	1 72	4 08	1 92	−3 57***
Total activity[b]	12 63	3 68	13 99	3 28	−2 35**
Whistle, hum	50	1 13	94	1 50	−1 96**
Physical aggression	31	73	59	96	−1 91*
	Toy Choice				
Items characteristic of girls:					
Dollhouse, dolls	1 24	1 79	09	29	5 46***
Art materials	18	72	01	12	2 01**
Spirograph	39	92	13	55	2 09**
Magnetik	41	90	17	58	1 88*
Items characteristic of boys:					
Castle and knights	1 04	1 38	2 61	1 97	−5 55***
Plumber's pipes	0	0	09	37	−2 10**
Pool, divers	65	1 00	97	1 36	−1 63*
Wind-up cars	13	44	31	79	−1 69*

[a] Two-tailed t tests between means.
[b] Sum across 7 min of run = 3, walk = 2, and sit = 1. Scores range from 7 to 21.
* $p < .10$.
** $p < .05$.
*** $p < .01$.

from Tauber, M. A. (1979). Parental socialization techniques and sex differences in children's play. Child Development, 50, 225-234.

TABLE 4

T3 Adolescent Attributes by Sex of Child and by T3 Family Status

(Intact, Step or Single at T3)

[Sample = All families in study at T3, except 3 who could not be classified into Intact, Step or Single]

	AGENTIC						GENERAL COMPETENCE			COGNITIVE COMPETENCE		COMMUNAL		
	Emancipated		Explorative		Gregarious		Resilient		Optimistic	Cog. Motiv. Ach. Orien.		Self Regulated	Bem Social Desirability	
Family Status	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	T	T	T	T	G	B
Mean														
Intact at T3	48	49	48	50	52	48	51	50	51	52	51	52	53	48
Step at T3	53	53	51	52	47	48	41	53	49	48	50	47	51	47
Single at T3	60	47	58	48	56	46	51	46	45	46	45	46	53	46
F-Ratio														
Status	3.46**		1.48		0.78		0.96		3.38*	4.55*	4.97**	4.01*	0.31	
Sex	3.14+		1.27		4.05*		0.89		0.22	0.46	0.20	0.04	6.34*	
Interaction	4.63*		4.00*		1.74		3.66*		0.38	0.31	1.21	1.03	0.19	

	COMMUNAL	CONFORMING		PROBLEM BEHAVIOR							
	Socially Responsible	Ethical Drug Beliefs	Bem Femininity	Internalizing Prob. Beh.	Total Prob.Beh.	Alienation	Externalizing Prob. Beh.	Alcohol Usage	Drug Usage	Sexual Acting Out	
Family Status	G B	G B	G B	T	T	T	G B	G B	G B	G	B
Mean											
Intact at T3	52 50	52 49	54 47	49	48	49	47 50	49 51	46 50	47	48
Step at T3	44 52	50 46	53 47	55	53	54	56 59	46 56	50 54	53	63
Single at T3	49 50	43 51	57 42	52	55	53	63 50	57 51	63 52	60	54
F-Ratio											
Status	3.24*	1.69	0.15	3.27*	7.02***	3.09*	11.97***	2.00	9.17***	15.56***	
Sex	3.29+	0.02	19.37***	1.34	0.06	1.61	2.06	0.81	0.21	0.29	
Interaction	2.68+	3.52*	2.17	0.08	2.23	1.49	7.79***	3.85*	6.39**	3.37*	

N		
	G	B
Intact	47	40
Step	9	9
Single	12	18

NOTE: Means are reported only for terms which are significant ($p < .10$) in the ANOVA.
Means are reported for sex of child only when the main effect of sex or the status-by-sex interaction is significant.
+ = $p < .10$; * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$.

April 24, 1989

Diana Baumrind

28

29

Table 5

Time 1 Parenting Practices by Sex-of-Child and Sex-of-Parent

[Sample = all T1 subjects (all are intact)]

	DEMANDING						RESPONSIVE		PSYCHOLOGICALLY DIFFERENTIATED		PARENT PROBLEM BEHAVIOR			
	Expresses Anger		Confronts		Firm		Responsive		Indiv & Indep.		Externalizing		N	
	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B
Mean														
Mother	48	50	48	50	47	50	51	52	51	51	55	51	57	71
Father	50	52	49	52	49	52	49	48	50	49	50	49	57	71
F-Ratio														
Sex-of-Child	1.26		3.37+		4.36*		0.19		0.01		1.40			
Sex-of-Parent	3.28+		6.79*		8.25**		10.37**		3.64+		6.55**			
Interaction	0.03		0.04		0.28		2.11		0.30		0.75			

NOTE: Means are reported only for terms which are significant ($p < .10$) in the ANOVA.
+ = $p < .10$; * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$.

Table 6

Time 2 Parenting Practices by Sex-of-Child and Sex-of-Parent

[Sample = all Intact T2 subjects]

	RESTRICTIVE								DEMANDING						RESPONSIVE				PSYCHOLOGICALLY DIFFERENTIATED	
	Maintains Struct. & Regimen		Directive		Conventional		Rule Oriented		Expresses Anger		Requires Household Help		Firm		Responsive		Positive Reinforcement		Intellect. Stimulating	
	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B
Mean																				
Mother	55	51	54	51	51	50	48	51	48	47	50	48	51	48	51	52	53	50	52	50
Father	51	48	50	48	51	53	49	52	55	51	52	50	53	51	50	47	52	48	53	49
F-Ratio																				
Sex-of-Child	4.31*		3.15+		0.01		2.52		2.71+		1.52		2.84+		0.18		4.99*		4.43*	
Sex-of-Parent	34.17***		41.57***		7.92**		4.38*		20.14***		19.15***		18.54***		12.73***		3.46+		0.03	
Interaction	0.29		0.97		3.78*		2.04		0.89		0.29		0.07		4.38*		0.46		0.10	

	PARENT PROBLEM BEHAVIOR										N	
	Internalizing		Externalizing		Field Independence		Moral Reasoning		Guilt Induction			
	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B
Mean												
Mother	49	50	51	51	47	48	50	49	53	51	60	73
Father	49	52	48	49	51	52	52	52	49	47		
F-Ratio												
Sex-of-Child	2.41		0.50		1.17		0.01		1.72			
Sex-of-Parent	3.31+		11.17***		9.32**		5.82*		21.74***			
Interaction	1.58		0.26		0.54		1.05		0.04			

NOTE: Means are reported only for terms which are significant ($p < .10$) in the ANOVA.
+ = $p < .10$; * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$.

Table 7

Correlations Between Factors by Parent-Child Play Pairs

in Child Active Play at Time 2

	Parental Sociable Play		Parental Active Play		Parental Bouyant Support		Parental Abrasive Talk	
	With Mother	With Father	With Mother	With Father	With Mother	With Father	With Mother	With Father
Girls	.23*	.46	.47***	.74***	.34***	-.47	.27**	.33
Boys	.16	.44	.45***	.79**	.24**	.74**	.36***	.84***

	N	
	With Mother	With Father
Girls	56	13
Boys	67	8

* $p < .10$
** $p < .05$
*** $p < .01$

from Tauber, M.A. (1979). Sex differences in parent-child interaction styles during a free-play session. Child Development, 50, 981-988.

Table 8

Hours spent Housekeeping and Childrearing by Mothers and Fathers at T3 as a function of Mother Working (50% or more)

[Sample = Two parent families; intact or remarried at T3]

	HOUSEKEEPING		CHILDREARING		
	Mother	Father	Mother	Father	N
Mean					
Non-Working Mother	27.33	4.71	24.47	6.72	55
Working Mother	14.24	6.88	21.75	5.05	24
F-Ratio					
Mother Working		10.34**		2.15	
Sex of Parent		74.21***		15.81***	
Interaction		14.84***		0.74	

Note. + = p <.10; * = p <.05; ** = p <.01; *** = p <.001.
Reduced N is due to missing self-report data. (Most working mothers were single)

Table 9

T3 Parenting Practices by Sex of Child and by Sex of Parent

[Sample = Intact at T3]

	RESTRICTIVE	DEMANDING		
	Officious	Assertive Control	N	
	T	T	G	B
Mean				
Mother	53	53	40	38
Father	[illegible]	51		
F-Ratio				
Sex of Child	.83	2.66		
Sex of Parent	8.26**	4.79*		
Interaction	2.17	.03		

NOTE: There were no significant main effects or interactions for sex-of-child. Means are reported for sex of child only when the main effect of sex or the status-by-sex interaction is significant. * = p <.05; ** = p <.01.

T3 Family Life Self-Report
(Completed by Mother and Father Separately)

Significant differences on the following scales:

Boys > Girls	Girls > Boys	Mothers > Fathers	Fathers > Mothers
Father smacks or spanks	Father praises good behavior	Parent lets adolescent know s/he was hurt by him/her	Parent threatens adolescent with physical punishment
Father/Mother lets adolescent know s/he is hurt		Parent acts distant until adolescent improves	
Mother lets adolescent know she is disappointed		Hours/week spent on housekeeping	
Mother isolates adolescent		Hours/week spent on childrearing	
Father/Mother acts distant until adolescent improves			
Mother takes away privileges			
Father shames adolescent			
Father grants privileges as a reward			
Mother sees father as more involved in childrearing			

Table 11

T3 Family Interaction Discussion

Boys > Girls	Girls > Boys	Mothers > Fathers	Fathers > Mothers
Harmonious interaction (Adolescent)	Mother Conflict Tolerant	Peacemaking (parent of boys only)	Conflict-Tolerant
Harmonious interaction (Mother)	Adolescent Conflict Tolerant	Egalitarian to other parent	Unpressured to participate (parents of girls only)
Engaged (Mother)	Father & Adolescent form coalitions	Treats as more capable of understanding her point of view (parents of girls only)	Playful (parents of girls only)
Friendly (All Participants)			
Peace-making (All Participants)			
Mother, Father and Adolescent each participate more			
Mother & Father each less pressured			
Mother unconstrained			

Table 12

T1 Maternal & Paternal Parenting Practices by Sex of Child and by Family Status (Intact at T2 vs. Divorced T1-T2)

[all T1 to T2 subjects]

	Joint				Mother								N	
	RESTRICTIVE		DEMANDING		RESPONSIVE		PSYCHOLOGICALLY DIFFERENTIATED				PARENT PROBLEM BEHAVIOR			
	Maintains Struct.& Regimen		Demands Maturity		Responsive		Self-Aware & Confident		Encourages Individ. & Indep.		Internalizing /Maladjusted		Externalizing /Exploitive			
Family Status	G	B	G	B	G	B	T		G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B
Mean																
Intact at T2	50	51	48	49	54	51	52		52	50	49	50	50	49	38	50
Divorced T1-T2	43	41	59	44	45	50	47		56	48	67	52	62	49	6	7
F-Ratio																
Status	10.26***		.75		2.78+		8.51**		.18		12.75***		4.41*			
Sex	.06		6.02*		.54		.94		3.14+		6.15*		5.08*			
Interaction	.30		6.11*		3.29+		1.88		1.24+		8.41**		4.38*			

	Father							
	DEMANDING				RESPONSIVE		PSYCHOLOGICALLY DIFFERENTIATED	PARENT PROBLEM BEHAVIOR
	Confronts		Firm		Responsive		Self-Aware & Confident	Internalizing /Maladjusted
Family Status	G	B	G	B	G	B	G B	T
Mean								
Intact at T2	49	53	48	54	52	48	50	51
Divorced T1-T2	49	54	51	55	46	40	46	54
F-Ratio								
Status	0.16		.78		4.72*		2.89+	2.58+
Sex	3.97*		3.18+		3.00+		1.11	.52
Interaction	0.18		.03		.17		.08	.09

NOTE: Means are reported only for terms which are significant ($p < .10$) in the ANOVA.
Means are reported for sex of child only when the main effect of sex or the status-by-sex interaction is significant.
+ = $p < .10$; * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$.

Table 13

T2 Maternal Parenting Practices by Sex of Child and by Family Status

(Intact at T2 vs. Divorced T1-T2)

[all T2 subjects]

Mother

	RESTRICTIVE			DEMANDING				PSYCHOLOGICALLY DIFFERENTIATED	PARENT PROBLEM BEHAVIOR					
	Maintains Struct. & Regimen	Directive	Conventional	Requires Household Help		Firm		Intellectually Stimulating	Internalizing		Externalizing		Rule-Oriented	
Family Status	T	T	T	G	B	G	B	T	G	B	G	B	G	B
Mean														
Intact at T2	53	53	50	50	48	51	48	51	48	49	49	50	50	52
Divorced T1-T2	43	49	45	47	56	44	48	47	61	51	57	53	43	51
F-Ratio														
Status	19.58***	3.88*	6.93***	1.67		3.04+		4.10*	11.03***		4.07*		6.82*	
Sex	.54	.54	.01	2.13		.18		.83	6.78*		3.64+		3.57+	
Interaction	.97	.32	.28	6.67***		3.25+		.29	9.12**		5.58*		2.35+	

Joint (Mother + Father)

	PSYCHOLOGICALLY DIFFERENTIATED			
	Differentiated 2nd Order Comp.		N	
Family Status	G	B	G	B
Mean				
Intact at T2	53	50	60	73
Divorced T1-T2	47	45	18	13
F-Ratio				
Status	4.92*			
Sex	5.22*			
Interaction	.44			

Note: Due to small n, step & divorced families are combined; same effect found if three family types (intact, step & single) are analyzed separately. Only variables with significant main effects or interactions are reported. Means are reported for sex of child only when the main effect of sex or the status-by-sex interaction is significant. + = p <.10; * = p <.05; ** = p <.01; *** = p <.001.

Table 14

T2 Maternal & Paternal Parenting Practices by Sex of Child and by Family Status

(Intact at T3 vs. Divorced T2-T3)

[Sample = Intact at T2 who continued on to T3]

Mother

	DEMANDING	RESPONSIVE	PSYCHOLOGICALLY DIFFERENTIATED		PARENT PROBLEM BEHAVIOR		Joint PSYCHOLOGICALLY DIFFERENTIATED	N	
	Firm	Positive Reinforcement	Intellectually Stimulating	Individuated & Self-Confident	Internalizing	Externalizing	Differentiated 2nd Order Comp.		
Family Status	G B	G B	T	T	T	G B	G B	G	B
Mean									
Intact at T3	52 47	52 48	52	52	47	48 49	53 50	47	42
Divorced T2-T3	41 51	53 46	44	42	59	66 54	48 45	5	16
F-Ratio									
Status	1.27	.02	7.08**	13.20***	5.34*	25.79***	6.51*		
Sex	1.14	2.96+	.27	.50	.29	7.63**	3.99*		
Interaction	6.13*	.40	.57	1.92	1.21	8.86**	.01		

Father

	RESTRICTIVE	DEMANDING	RESPONSIVE		PSYCHOLOGICALLY DIFFERENTIATED		PARENT PROBLEM BEHAVIOR		N	
	Maintains Struct.& Regimen	Expresses Anger	Responsive	Positive Reinforcement	Intellect. Stimulating	Individuated & Self-Confident	Internalizing	Externalizing		
Family Status	G B	T	T	G B	T	T	T	T	G	B
Mean										
Intact at T3	51 48	52	50	51 46	52	51	47	48	43	42
Divorced T2-T3	45 52	58	39	52 46	43	49	60	57	5	16
F-Ratio										
Status	.21	5.18*	9.54**	.06	4.96*	3.68+	26.11***	11.21**		
Sex	.52	1.29	.98	2.84+	2.75	1.91	.10	.48		
Interaction	2.82+	2.50	.46	.05	.58	1.21	.57	.70		

NOTE: Means are reported only for terms which are significant ($p < .10$) in the ANOVA.
Means are reported for sex of child only when the main effect of sex or the status-by-sex interaction is significant.
+ = $p < .10$; * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$.

Table 15

T3 Adolescent Attributes by Sex of Child and Family Status

(Intact at T2 vs. Divorced T1-T2)

[Sample = All T1-T2-T3 Subjects]

	Socially Responsible		Externalizing		N	
Family Status	G	B	G	B	G	B
Mean						
Intact at T2	50	52	49	50	31	41
Divorced T1-T2	44	57	61	47	5	5
F-Ratio						
Status	0.02		1.75			
Sex	5.62*		3.45+			
Interaction	3.01+		4.83*			

Table 16

T3 Maternal Childrearing Practices & Personal Attributes by Sex of Child and by Family Status

(Intact, Step or Single at T3)

[Sample = All Mothers in study at T3 except 3 who could not be classified as Intact, Step or Single]

	RESTRICTIVE			DEMANDING		RESPONSIVE		PARENT PROBLEM BEHAVIOR				N	
	Directive/ Conventional		Conforming	Assertive Control		Supportive Control	Considerate	Internalizing /Maladjusted		Externalizing /Exploitive			
Family Status	G	B	T	G	B	T	T	G	B	G	B	G	B
Mean													
Intact at T3	53	53	53	54	51	52	52	47	48	47	47	43	39
Step at T3	42	44	44	44	43	46	46	58	51	59	53	8	9
Single at T3	41	49	45	41	50	47	47	60	50	59	52	11	16
F-Ratio													
Status	12.16***		16.61***	11.59***		4.80**	4.62*	8.08***		12.75***			
Sex	2.95+		0.18	0.84		0.01	0.21	6.69*		4.70*			
Interaction	1.70		0.76	3.90*		1.11	0.26	3.75*		2.37+			

NOTE: Means are reported only for terms which are significant ($p < .10$) in the ANOVA.
Means are reported for sex of child only when the main effect of sex or the structure by sex interaction is significant.
+ = $p < .10$; * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$; *** = $p < .001$.

Table 17

Significant Differences in T2 & T3 Attributes for Boys

from Divorced Mother and Father Custody Homes at T3

[Sample = Families of Boys Divorced by T3]

	Custody			
	Mother	Father	t	p
T3 Maturity	47	39	2.18	<.05
T3 Resilient	48	40	2.13	<.05
T3 Optimum Competence	48	39	2.11	<.06
T3 Self-Regulated	49	40	1.77	<.10
T3 Socially Conscious	51	43	1.80	<.10
T2 Creative	46	57	-2.40	<.03
T2 Cooperative	50	37	2.81	<.01
N	11	6		

There are no differences in problem behavior at any time period, but there are in competencies. (Parenthetically, for families of boys divorced by T3, there are no discernible differences at T2 between mothers or fathers who will assume custody at T3 and those who will not. At T1, n too low at T1 to permit comparisons.)

Note: Boldface names are composite measures

48

49

Table 18

Significant Correlations where there are Sex Differences in Parent-Child Correlations (Illustrative)

Time 1: Preschool Child Variables

T1 Parent Variable:	Dominant G	Dominant B	Purposive G	Purposive B	General Competence G	General Competence B	Friendly G	Friendly B	Cooperative G	Cooperative B	Internalizing G	Internalizing B	Externalizing G	Externalizing B
F. Expresses Anger											--	.48		
F. Confronts											--	.37		
Demands Household Help (Joint)							--	.35	--	.36			-.44	--
Maintains Structure & Regimen (Joint)	--	.27	--	.35	--	.36								
M. Internalizing											--	.42		
F. Internalizing											.58	--		
F. Externalizing											.57	--	.72	--

Time 2: Primary School Child Variables

T2 Parent Variables:	Socially Confident G	Socially Confident B	Optimum Competence G	Optimum Competence B	Creative G	Creative B	Achiev. Oriented G	Achiev. Oriented B	Internalizing G	Internalizing B	Emotional Disabil. G	Emotional Disabil. B	Externalizing G	Externalizing B
M. Directive													-.34	.31
Maintains Struct. & Regimen													-.45	--
M. Firm	.32	--												
F. Firm	.35	--												
M. Responsive			--	.36	--	.32	--	.34						
F. Proscriptions (J&J)	--	-.35	--	-.33										
F. Rule-Oriented (H&D)			--	-.33										
F. Tradit. Religious Bel.	--	-.48									--	.30		
M. Tradit. Religous Bel.											--	.30		
M. Internalizing					--	-.28			--	.37				
M. Externalizing					--	-.30								

Time 3: Adolescent Variables

T3 Parent Variable:	Socially Conscious G	Socially Conscious B	Resilient G	Resilient B	Self-Regulated G	Self-Regulated B	Socially Responsible G	Socially Responsible B	J & J Religious G	J & J Religious B	J & J Conservative G	J & J Conservative B	Externalizing G	Externalizing B	Drug Usage G	Drug Usage B	Sexual Acting Out G	Sexual Acting Out B
M. Intrusive/Officious											--	.42						
F. Intrusive/Officious											--	.37						
M. Directive/Conventional									--	.67								
F. Conforming	-.47	--																
M. Assertive Control			.40	--	.58[D]	--	.59[D]	--										
M. Supportive Control															-.45	--		
M. Internalizing/Maladjusted																	.44[D]	--
M. Externalizing/Exploitive													.51[D]	--	.43[D]	--	.53[D]	--

Note: -- indicates no significant difference from 0 when there is a significant sex-difference. The absence of a notation for either sex indicates the absence of a sex difference in the magnitude of the correlations (both or neither of which may be significant). J&J = Jessor & Jessor (1970); H&D = Hogan & Dickstein (1972).
D = Sex difference significant for divorced families only.

Table 19

T2 Differences between Girls and Boys as a function of T2 Family Pattern for Total & Non-Divorced (Intact) Sample for Variables with a Significant Sex Difference for the Total Sample

	T2 Family Pattern							
	ENGAGED		RESTRICTIVE		LENIENT		UNENGAGED	
	Total	Intact	Total	Intact	Total	Intact	Total	Intact
Peer-Ascendant	-2.47	-3.66	.10	.02	-2.74	-3.16	-7.85**	-9.23
General Competence	1.34	1.31	10.27**	9.26*	-.26	-1.51	7.03*	4.22
Optimum Competence	1.42	1.40	11.04**	9.79**	-1.48	-3.24	5.12	1.71
Achievement Oriented	3.66	3.84	10.20**	10.86**	-.68	-1.97	5.77+	2.20
Friendly	.99	.97	3.83	2.06	3.93	3.75	8.43**	8.56*
Internal Locus of Control for Doing Poorly	-2.63	-2.82	-8.97*	-9.73*	-6.56*	-6.54*	-8.80**	-7.63*
Cooperative	2.80	2.64	1.80	2.10	5.68*	6.87*	12.56***	14.61***
Crandall Social Desirability	2.55	3.99	1.33	1.90	4.69	2.93	5.49*	2.13
N (Girl/Boy)	(22/25)	(21/21)	(12/11)	(10/10)	(25/27)	(19/23)	(18/21)	(9/18)

Engaged: Parents are High Demanding and High Responsive

Restrictive: Parents are High Demanding and Low Responsive

Lenient: Parent are Low Demanding and High Responsive

Unengaged: Parents are Low Demanding and Low Responsive

Note: All scores are the differences between standard scores (mean = 50, SD = 10) for girls and boys (girls minus boys); positive scores occur when girls have higher scores than boys, negative scores occur when boys have higher scores than girls.
+ = p <.10; * = p <.05; ** = p <.01; *** = p <.001

Table 20

Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression

with T3 Adolescent Socially Responsible as the Dependent Variable

	Independent Variable	Order of Entry	Girl Beta	Girl r	Girl R^2 Change	Boy Beta	Boy r	Boy R^2 Change	Difference Beta	Difference r
Set I:	**Process Variables**									
	M. Supportive Control	1	.31**	.54***	.29	.40***	.42***	.17	ns	ns
	M. Assertive Control	2	.42***	.59***	.11	.01	.21+	.00	p <.05	p <.05
Set II:	**Problem Behaviors**									
	M. Externalizing	ne	-.13	-.44***	--	-.13	-.35**	--	ns	ns
	Family Disorganization	ne	-.23	-.54***	--	-.05	-.22+	--	ns	p <.05
	M. Internalizing	ne	.04	-.37**	--	.11	-.15	--	ns	ns
Set III:	**Family Status**									
	Intact	ne	.01	.35**	--	-.09	-.03	--	ns	p <.05
	R^2		40%			17%			p <.05	
	Adjusted R^2		38%			15%				
	N		64			67				

Note: Sets are entered in a theoretically pre-determined hierarchical order, with the variables within the sets entered in a stepwise manner. Only variables which contribute significantly ($p < .05$) to the regressions when first entered are included in the final regression. Betas are calculated after including all the variables that contribute significantly to the regressions when first entered. Thus, Assertive Control is controlled for Family Supportive Control and vice versa. Order of Entry is for the sexes combined (so that the betas for males and females can be compared). Intact Family Status is converted into a dummy variable. ne = not entered.

Table 21

Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression

with T3 Adolescent Externalizing Problem Behavior as the Dependent Variable

Independent Variable	Order of Entry	Girl Beta	Girl r	Girl R^2 Change	Boy Beta	Boy r	Boy R^2 Change	Difference Beta	Difference r
Set I: Problem Variables									
M. Externalizing	ne	.17	.42***	--	.02	.19	--	ns	ns
Family Disorganization	1	.17	.46***	.21	.25+	.38**	.15	ns	ns
Set II: Process Behaviors									
M. Supportive Control	ne	-.17	-.46***	--	-.17	-.35**	--	ns	ns
M. Assertive Control	2	-.47***	-.57***	.13	-.27*	-.39**	.04	ns	ns
Directive/Conventional	ne	-.05	-.25*	--	.05	-.13	--	ns	ns
Set III: Family Status									
Intact	ne	-.14	-.44***	--	.05	-.09	--	ns	p <.05
R^2			34%			20%		p <.06	
Adjusted R^2			32%			17%			
N			64			67			

Note: Sets are entered in a theoretically pre-determined hierarchical order, with the variables within the sets entered in a stepwise manner. Only variables which contribute significantly ($p < .05$) to the regressions when first entered are included in the final regression. Betas are calculated after including all the variables that contribute significantly to the regressions when first entered. Thus, Assertive Control is controlled for Family Disorganization and vice versa. When (based on theoretical considerations) the set of Problem Variables were entered first, Family Disorganization was significant. Therefore, it was included, although no longer significant after entering Assertive Control in Set II. Order of Entry is for the sexes combined (so that the betas for males and females can be compared). Intact Family Status is converted into a dummy variable. ne = not entered.